2 2

243801

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
06/243,801	03/16/81	LANGER A	Y153A

FLEIT AND JACOBSON
2033 M STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER	
KAMM W	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
375	2

DATE MAILED: 06/15/82

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined. ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892
2. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Drawing, PTO-948
3. ☐ Notice of References Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449
4. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152
5. ☐ _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-24 are pending in the application.

   Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.

4. ☒ Claims 1-24 are rejected.

5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☐ The formal drawings filed on _____ are acceptable.

8. ☐ The drawing correction request filed on _____ has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved.

9. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has
   ☐ been received. ☐ not been received. ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____,
   filed on _____.

10. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

11. ☐ Other

PTOL-326 (rev. 7-79)

EXAMINER'S ACTION

63

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required at such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.

2. If applicant desires priority under 35 U.S.C. 120 based upon a parent application, specific reference to the parent application must be made in the instant application.

This should appear as the first sentence of the specification following the title, preferably as a separate paragraph. Status of the parent application (whether patented or abandoned) should also be included. If a parent application has become a patent, the expression "Patent No." should follow the filing date of the parent application. If a parent application has become abandoned, the expression "abandoned" should follow the filing date of the parent application. Since the serial number of the alleged parent application is not given, the reference is not sufficiently specific.

3. Claims 1-5 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as clearly anticipated by Rubin because the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, more than one

year prior to the date of the application for patent in the United States.

4. 35 U.S.C. 103 reads:

"A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made".

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103, recited above, as being unpatentable over Rubin in view of Denniston et al. Providing two separate processors is an obvious matter of choice in view of Denniston et al..

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103, recited above, as being unpatentable over Rubin in view of the European patent to Buffet. Employing microprocessing circuitry is an obvious design alternative in view of the wide use of such technology

today as illustrated for example by the European patent to Buffet, Fig. 2.

7. Claims 8-9,15-19 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103, recited above, as being unpatentable over Rubin in view of Rizk or Auerbach et al.. Employing a forced R-wave detector is an obvious matter of choice in view of the teaching of Rizk (116-121) or Auerbach et al. (Fig. 33).

8. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 recited above as being unpatentable over Rubin in view of Rizk or Auerbach et al.. as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Mirowshi et al. Providing a data input/output channel is obvious in view of Mirowshi et al. (16,18,28,30).

9. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 recited above as being unpatentable over Rubin in view of Rizk or Auerbach et al. as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of the European patent to Buffet. As noted above, the use of microprocessor equipment is an obvious matter of choice especially in view of the teaching of Buffet.

W. E. Kamm/mb
703-557-3144
6/10/82

WM. E. KAMM
EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 335

64